

B R O B D I N G N A G

Brondingnag #89

Odds and Ends Issue.

23 November 1968

Dick Schultz.

In Graustark, a year or so ago, Boardman made the statement that Brobdingnag was born in Detroit. Judging by the odd item in letters which I have received since then, his remark has given rise to the misconception that I (jamco) used to live in Detroit. Far from it - I have lived all my life in Canada. I have been in Detroit a few times, usually while waiting for train connections between Toronto and Chicago, and was there once for the better part of a week while attending a conference, but that is the extent of my connection with the only city in the contiguous United States from which you must drive south to go to Canada.

How this misunderstanding arose is that Boardman was referring to Brobdingnag's origins; not mine. When Boardman began his third game, 1964B the Fredonia game, he received so many applications that there were almost enough to make up an additional game. John asked that some one else publish that extra game and Richard Schultz, then and now a resident of Detroit, volunteered. He established a magazine, Brobdingnag, to carry the game and it began publication in May 1964. It wasn't until 16 or 17 months later that I took over publication of Brobdingnag although I was a subscriber to it from its first issue. Schultz' Brobdingnag quickly established a reputation as the friendliest of the Dippy zines then appearing - a quality which it lost when transferred to new management, when nit-picking about the rules and pontification about rating lists became the order of the day.

Dick was one of the first postal Diplomacy players, his first game being 1964A, the third game formed; in fact he was in every game begun in 1964, except 1964C, of which he was gamesmaster. Not in any game at the moment, he tells me, in a recent note, that his interest is not dead, merely dormant, and that he hopes to play again when time and circumstance permit. Of course he needs more time than most of us as his interest centres largely on the press releases. He thinks nothing of sending in two pages of press releases to accompany a single move and has written several complete stories based on Diplomacy situations. The first was a story appearing in Die Wis #12, based on an event in game 1964A; it appeared as a rider to an issue of Graustark in which that game was played. A Sky on Fire was a stream-of-consciousness story of an English soldier in a trench in Holland; it appeared in Trantor and was based on the opening moves of game 1964D in that zine. Double-Double was distributed with an issue of sTab and was the culmination of a series of war reports in previous issues which had accompanied game 1965E. Dick once told me that he wrote a fourth Diplomacy-based story which has not been published.

Dick is/was a member of EAPA and OMPA, two stf press associations. The stories mentioned above were submitted as contributions

to them, as well as receiving distribution through Diplomacy channels. Some of the AFA members turned out to be rather cold to the idea of Diplomacy when they found out what it was all about.

In the last couple of years Dick has become an avid fan of "The Avengers" TV program. Something over a year ago he began publication of a zine devoted to the show, and issues of En Garde have appeared at intervals of 2 or 3 months ever since. Any readers who are fans of "The Avengers" and who haven't seen this publication should write him. The most recent issue costs 70 cents and a super gala issue, due out shortly, will cost \$1.25. If these prices seem excessive for an amateur publication it should be noted that an average issue runs to eighty pages or so and that the zine is extensively illustrated with publicity still photos and the like.

Right now Dick is incensed. It seems that a foul plot is afoot to axe "The Avengers" at the mid-season program change. It is the note of urgency in a communication which I received from Dick a few days ago which prompted my running this item at this time. I myself know nothing about "The Avengers"; I have only seen one episode of it and that while trying to get through a dull evening sitting in a hotel room. However, if it is half as good as Dick claims there must be other admirers of it out there. If any such want to help his campaign to have it retained they should write

Richard M. Schultz,
19159 Helen,
Detroit, Mich., 48234.

Game Vacancies.

In Graustark #168, John Boardman offers two new games with a fee of \$3.50. The first Diplomacy zine published, Graustark has always been one of the most popular playing arenas; it is also one of the two magazines now appearing which maintains the playing rate, at one time standard, of a move every two weeks.

The other zine to run games at a fast rate, Charles Reinsel's Big Brother, is also considering a new game. In the latest issue, #76, Charles states that he will offer one more game if there is sufficient interest. The fee is \$6 for a player who hasn't played in Big Brother before, \$4.50 for a former player, and \$3 for a current player.

Players have often told me that they like a promptly run game which adheres rigidly to its deadlines. If you feel that way, now is your chance. The only two gamesmasters who are always on schedule and who use a two week deadline are both offering games - likely the last ones either will offer for a long time to come. Don't miss this chance and then grumble about slow games. Speed is of the essence in play in both these zines. Speed in submitting your fee and application

is likewise advisable if you hope to enter these games as they will probably fill very fast. The addresses,

John Boardman, 592 16th St., Brooklyn, NY, 11218, and don't use a Henry Ford stamp on your letter or it will be returned to you unopened.

Charles W. Reinsel, 120 8th Ave., Clarion, Penna., 16214, and don't plaster the letter with Peace propaganda stickers or your letter may be returned to you unopened.

It will be noticed that both zines have a fee above the average figure, much above in one case. It is but one more instance of a general rule enunciated by General Wavell many years ago - "An apparently insignificant increase in speed - in horses, women, or cars - will double the price of the article."

For those satisfied with a more moderate rate of play, it is believed that the following zines have openings: Ragnarok (John Moning, 318 South Bella Vista, Youngstown, Ohio, 44509), Costaguana, (Conrad W. von Metzke, 5327 Hilltop Drive, San Diego, Calif., 92114), ADAC, (Hal Naua, 3221 National Ave., #91, National City, Calif., 92050), Jutland Jollies, (Bob Lake, Apt. 904, 35 Esterbrooke Ave., Willowdale, Ontario), The Diplomat, (Eric W. Just, Box 131, Paoli, Okla., 73074), International Enquirer (Clif Ollila, Apt. 6, 1501 11th Ave, S., Minneapolis, Minn., 55404), Diplophobia (replacement players only), (Don Miller, 12315 Judson Road, Wheaton, Md., 20906), Glockoria, (Dave Lebling, Box 2122, Burton House, 420 Memorial Drive, Cambridge, Mass., 02139), La Guerre, (Buddy Trettick, 3702 Wendy Lane, Silver Spring, Md., 20906), Median Chronicles, (Gerhard Graebner, 309 Hearne, U. of Saskatchewan Residence, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan), Spald, Jr. (Rob Perkins, 2755 Carlaris Rd., San Marino, Calif., 91108), Dies Irae (Conrad von Metzke, address above), Verbal Chaos Ltd., Bill McDuffie, Clarkson College of Technology, Brook House, Box 380, Potsdam, NY, 13676). Fees vary; write the editors concerned for details. Last week, as most weeks, some one wrote asking when I was going to start a new game. A perusal of this page should convince anyone that there is no great need for additional game openings right now.

Contests.

In EMOE #84 there appeared the quotation, "...the sordidness of war. You cannot gild it. The raw shows through." and readers were asked to indicate the author. Only one, Derek Nelson, sent a reply. He said, "Is it Winston Churchill?" It is indeed. The quotation is an excerpt from a letter to his mother written two days after the battle of Omdurman, in which Churchill had taken part as a lieutenant in the cavalry (in a regiment of which he was not a member, and against the express wishes of the commander-in-chief, Lord Kitchener.)

In BROB #88 a number of addresses were listed and readers were asked to tell what they had in common. Two, Doug Beyerlein and Rod Walker, sent replies. They both said that they were addresses of Dan Brannan. This is obviously on the right track. Note, however, that one of the addresses was Kalston, Alberta, where Brannan has never been. Unless, of course, he transformed himself from a woolly caterpillar to a gopher or an antelope, so that I didn't notice him among the local fauna. The addresses were those from which Wild in Woolly has been published or from which its publication was announced. The latter phrase is necessary because, on two occasions, the moves were so fast that an address announced became obsolete before the next issue of W'nW.

Those two contests had no prizes but things are looking up. Conrad von Metzke tells me that I have won a prize in one of his contests in Costaguana. The prize was to have been a free game in the zine of the winner's choice. Conrad has agreed that I can put the prize up again for further competition. Therefore -

A Conrad von Metzke Contest

1. As is well known, Conrad von Metzke is something of a linguist, speaking 6 languages the last time I discussed the matter with him, though he may have acquired additional ones since. Another Diplomacy player, Zita Rafailovich, who played for a time in Graustark, is also remarkably polyglot. Though other Diplomacy players cannot compete with those two, some knowledge of languages is fairly widespread in the postal game, and the nature of the game urges their use in press releases. What languages have been used in press releases and related material in Diplomacy zines? Replies should give a reasonably definite reference: "Swahili in Utopia #666, page 2, would be preferred, but vaguer indications will be accepted provided they are definite enough so that I can find the passage in question. To count, a passage should be at least a line or two long; interjected phrases like "ceteris paribus", "c'est la guerre", etc., usw., will not suffice.

2. What language, other than English, has been used most extensively in Postal Diplomacy press releases?

3. As is well known, Conrad's (Conrad von Metzke's, that is) Diplomacy zine, Costaguana, is named for the country in Conrad's (Joseph Conrad's, that is) novel 'Nostromo'. Like Conrad (Conrad von Metzke), Conrad (Joseph Conrad) was multilingual and many different languages appear in the novel. What languages appear in it?

4. As can be seen in the question above, there are difficulties in speaking of Joseph Conrad and about Conrad von Metzke at the same time. Is the duplication of names a coincidence? If not how do you account for it?

5. What language, spoken fluently by (J) Conrad, is not known by Conrad (vM)?

Deadline for answers to the above questions is New Year's Day, to give everyone a chance to renew acquaintance with 'Mostromo'. For obvious reasons, Conrad von Metzke is debarred from entering the contest; I hope he will not comment on it until it is over. The prize, which Conrad is putting up, is a free game in the zine of the winner's choice. I believe that Conrad has put a very generous time limit on this offer, it is good until next June. Entries are to be sent to me in Ralston and not, as you may have imagined, to Conrad in San Diego.

Recently Completed Games.

Six games have ended since the last issue of BROB. Individual notice of them appears below.

Game 1966A appeared in Lonely Mountain and was won by Jerry Pournelle, playing France. BROB's congratulations, Jerry, on your third win. In his commentary on this game, in Lonely Mountain #44, the Gamesmaster, Charles Wells, states that this was the most remarkable game he has ever seen. Though such statements from gamesmasters sometimes have to be discounted a little (we gamesmasters see our own games with that can only be called a parental eye), this game was unusual in several respects. In particular, mention should be made of the high quality of play displayed not only by the winner, but by the other two survivors, Terry Much and John Austin. The first two are very well known players of course; John Austin, though, is one of those who play in Lonely Mountain and not at all elsewhere, so that his ability is less well known. For the last six years of play he held out against the united onslaught of the remainder of the board, at two to one odds in strength. While this often means a rather dull stone-wall defence, in this game he was, for a time, at least, a genuine threat to the other two players; given an extra piece or two in 1911 he might even have won. As Lonely Mountain does not give a supply centre chart of the game, one is given below:

	<u>01</u>	<u>02</u>	<u>03</u>	<u>04</u>	<u>05</u>	<u>06</u>	<u>07</u>	<u>08</u>	<u>09</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>18</u>
E	3	3	5	3	3	4	5	5	5	3	2	2	OUT					
F	3	3	8	8	9	9	11	10	13	14	14	14	14	13	14	15	15	18
G	5	5	5	5	6	7	7	8	7	7	8	6	7	9	9	9	9	10
I	5	6	2	2	1	1	OUT											
A	4	OUT																
R	6	8	9	7	6	3	2	2	OUT									
T	4	6	7	9	9	10	9	9	9	10	10	11	11	12	11	10	10	6

Zine: Lonely Mountain, #s 7-44. Gamesmaster, Charles Wells. England, John McCallum. France, Jerry Pournelle. Germany, Terry Much. Italy, Charles Weinsel. Austria, Al Scott. Russia, Frank Reinhardt. Turkey, John Austin.

Game 1966H, Liplophobia's game PEA, was won, in issue 37 of that magazine, by Dave Lebling, Playing Austria. Congratulations, Dave, on your first

win! May there be many more. Perhaps we should also congratulate Austria, whose last previous win was almost two years ago. Again no supply centre chart is supplied in Diplophobia so one is given below,

	<u>01</u>	<u>02</u>	<u>03</u>	<u>04</u>	<u>05</u>	<u>06</u>	<u>07</u>	<u>08</u>	<u>09</u>	<u>10</u>
E	4	4	4	2	OUT					
F	5	7	7	8	9	9	10/9	9	6	5
G	5	5	7	8	10	11	10	11/9	13/10	11/9
H	4	2	1	OUT						
I	4	2	1	OUT						
A	5	6	7	8	10	11/10	12	13	14	18 and wins!
R	3	2	OUT							
T	5	8	8	8	5	3	2	1	OUT	

Zine: Diplomania 4-11, Diplophobia 1-37. Gamesmaster, Don Miller. England, Sidney Get, '02 Wayne Roheisel. France, John Mazor, '10 Doug Beyerlein. Germany, Jim Latimer. Italy, Don Brannan. Austria, Dave Lebling. Russia, Ron Parks. Turkey, Jim McDonnell, '01 Geo. Parks, '03 Jay Maldeman, '05 Dobson, '07 Phil Haus.

1966AB, begun in Orthanc as its game H, and transferred to sTab on the disappearance of Orthanc, also produced a first winner, Mehran Thomson, playing Germany. Congratulations! A full account of the game is expected to appear in sTab 57.

Game 1966BB also produced a first time winner, Larry Feery, playing Russia in ADAG. There is an account of the game, and a supply centre summary in ADAG #34. Congratulations, Larry.

Game 1967E, played in Stab in its Massif section, was won by Monte Zelazny, playing England. Like Jerry Pounelle's win, above, this is a third win for Monte. A discussion and supply centre chart will be found in #55 of its journal. It's rather needless to say, "Many more of them" to Monte; he will attend to that without urging.

Game 1967/F, The Winners' game, was played in Big Brother and was won by John Koning, his second win. Congratulations, John! Big Brother does not supply a chart of its games so one is given below:

	<u>01</u>	<u>02</u>	<u>03</u>	<u>04</u>	<u>05</u>	<u>06</u>	<u>07</u>	<u>08</u>	<u>09</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>15</u>
E	4	6	8	8	10	9	10	10	11	12	12	14	14	15	15 and wins!
F	5	6/5	5	4	2	1	1	1	OUT						
G	4	3	1	1	OUT										
I	4	4	5	6	7	8	8	8	8	7	7	5	5	6	8
A	5	6	7	7	8	9	9	9	9	9	8	9	9	6	4/2
R	6	6	8	8	7	7	6	6	6	6	7	6	6	7	7
T	4	3	OUT												

Zine: Big Brother, #'s 31-75. Gamesmaster, Charles Reinsol. England, John Koning. France, Jim Mackenzie. Germany, John Smythe. Italy,

Derek Nelson, Austria, Charles Wells, Russia, John McCallum, Turkey, Jerry Pournelle.

As most readers will know, Big Brother games, in addition to a number, have a distinguishing name given them. For most, such as "Lucky Seventh" the name is merely a tag. However, for two games it did indicate the way the game was formed. They were Big Brother's first game, called The Gamesmasters Game and its fourth one, the one we are here discussing, called The Winners' Game. Entrance to the first was restricted to gamesmasters, and to this one to former winners. The two games have a number of other interesting parallels:

1. Both games were rather long drawn out affairs, in contrast to the usual Big Brother game, most of which end long before 1911-12, the average for other zines.

2. In both games 3 players were eliminated, or practically so, by 1905-06, leaving four genuine survivors.

3. In both games three of the four survivors were John Koning, Charles Wells, and myself.

4. In both games a break in the play came when, following application of Reinsel's famous (I know there are other words) three-strikes-and-you-are-out policy, Charles Wells was thrown out of the game. In the Gamesmasters' Game, Wells was on vacation in Norway at the time and received an issue of BB late and was late in getting in his move. In the Winners' Game he had to take his wife to hospital for the birth of their second son on the deadline date, and again was late.

5. Following the removal of Wells, Koning and I were left in both games with a third player. In both cases it was the action of that third player which decided the form that the remainder of the game took.

In The Gamesmasters' Game, Dan Brannan was the other player. Playing France he had by far the greatest number of pieces on the board. Koning, playing Germany, had a sizable number of supply centres but, due to occupation of his home country by his own and hostile forces, could not build for them; at the time of Wells' departure his fighting strength was, I think, 5 units below his nominal supply centre strength. Brannan was, in a sense, fighting the board, but his earlier attacks on me had been rather light, I playing Italy, and he was just about to launch an attack on Wells' Turkey. In the mean time Wells and I had been carrying on a sparring match, neither of us accomplishing very much. With Wells' departure, Koning and I would undoubtedly have united all our strength against Brannan the front runner, who had been at war with Koning's Germany for years, and who had, somewhat mildly, stabbed me some time before. However, Koning and I did not have our forces in contact with one another, and it is doubtful how much mutual support we could have given one another. I think that had he pressed on resolutely Brannan had an almost sure win, although

Koning and I would have tried to make him earn his victory at least. However, Draxon was so upset by the removal of Wells, that he himself ceased play. The game then degenerated into a race between Koning and myself to see who could mop up French and Turkish territory the more rapidly, a race which Koning won without difficulty.

In the Winners' Game the other player was Derek Nelson, playing Italy. In some sort of alliance with Koning's England he had, in the years immediately prior to Wells' departure, been whittled down by his ally attacking him from the rear. Most of his remaining forces were in northern Italy pressing against the Austrian line. Wells' Austria and my Russia were in solid alliance. Wells had a solid array of force in the middle of the board stretching from Trieste through Munich to Berlin. I had units on both flanks, a two armies and a fleet in the Baltic-northern Russia sector, opposed to the English forces in Scandinavia, and the rest of my forces in the Mediterranean where they co-operated with two Austrian units there in opposing the Western Alliance. The Mediterranean Sea power of that alliance was by that time mostly English and was weak, as England had taken over Italian supply centres a little too rapidly, so that Italian naval strength was melting away faster than he could bring up his own fleets to replace it.

When Wells was declared out of the game I immediately contacted Derek with the suggestion that he change sides. Had he done so, I think that at least a deadlock would have been secured. The only Austrian centres that Koning's England could really get at were Munich and Berlin, all the others could have been split between Derek and myself. Moreover, at that moment, as stated, England's naval strength in the Mediterranean was not enough and I feel that Italy and Russia could have advanced in that theatre, although Russia would only have been able to fight in a defensive rear-guard action in the north. Had gains been made in the Mediterranean the situation would have been that the three remaining players would each have had about a third of the supply centres on the board. A three way dog-fight would have been the inevitable result, a fight in which Derek would have had as good a chance of a win as anyone. However, he turned down the offer, although it offered a near certainty of a stalemate at worst and a one third chance of a win if fortune smiled. By pressing on into the now undefended Austrian territory he had an assured second place position, assuring England's win in the process. He opted for this alternative leading to another similarity between the two games,

6. Koning won them both. John, when next you write tell me how you kept Derek in line. You had eaten him down from 8 centres to 5, if he went over he had a genuine chance of a win, and could at least be sure of a stalemate. How could you get him to give this up in return for a second place?

Another parallel between the two games, Meinsel's name games, was the inept play on my part; however; that will not serve to distinguish these two games from many others.

Rating List.

The six games mentioned above, plus normal wear and tear, lead to a revision of the Rating List. The last full version of it was given in EROB #88. The listing which follows is complete for the Top and Second Boards. For other players, however, there will only be a listing if there has been a change in score since that previous list. If your name does not appear your score is unchanged from that listing. Games now counted are 1963E, 1964A, B, D, 1965A, B, D, E, F, G, H, I, L, M, Q, R, S, T, U, V, W, 1966A, B, D, E, H, I, K, L, M, N, O, R, AA, AB, AC, AG, AI, AK, AL, AM, AQ, AU, AV, BB, BC, I, BG, BJ, EK, 1967E, H, AF, AK, AU, 1968F. For a total of 55 games.

Country List.

England	59.8%	+65	66.7 + 4 - 2	Trevor Mearndon
Turkey	56.5	+44	66.2 +10 +16	Jerry Pournelle (W)
France	55.3	+35	64.6 + 6 + 8	Douglas Beyerlein
Russia	50.6	+ 4	64.2 +17 +18	John McCallum (W)
Italy	43.8	-42	62.1 +16 +21	John Smythe (W)
Germany	43.8	-42	60.1 +15 +21	Derek Nelson (W)
Austria	40.3	-64	58.3 + 2 + 7	John Austin
			58.3 + 2 + 5	Wm Lee Linden
			58.3 + 2 - 2	Michael Childers
			57.1 + 6 + 14	James Latimer (W)
			55.9 +14 + 6	Charles Reinsel (W)

Top Board

Donald Miller (W)	89.1	+20	+20	52.4 + 2 + 2	James MacKenzie (W)
Monte Zelazny (W)	85.4	+32	+38	52.0 + 1 +19	David Lebling (W)
Harold Kaus (W)	81.6	+13	+33	51.4 + 1 +12	Allan Huff (W)
Eugene Prosnitz (W)	81.2	+10	+26	50.0 0 + 2	Richard Shagrin
Harold Peck (W)	81.2	+10	+14	50.0 0 0	Pat McDonnell
Banks Lebane	79.2	+12	+ 7	48.0 - 1 -13	Thomas Griffin (W)
Charles Turner (W)	78.6	+21	+30	46.5 - 3 + 6	Edi Birsan
				46.4 - 6 -10	Dan Brannan
				45.8 - 1 + 2	Gail Schow
				45.2 - 3 -10	Robert Ward
				45.1 - 2 +14	Greg Long
				45.1 - 2 - 2	Mark Owings
				42.8 - 2 - 2	Michael Makulin
				41.7 - 2 + 3	Wank Reinhardt
				40.3 - 4 - 5	Dave Francis
				38.3 - 6 -10	Jack Chalker
				35.8 -17 -18	Roland Trudiker
				34.4 - 5 - 9	Karl Wittmann
				33.8 -10 -14	Brian Bailey
				33.3 - 4 -10	John Benson
				31.2 - 6 -10	Greg Warden
				25.0 - 6 0	Al Scott
				25.0 - 6 - 6	Dick Payment
				23.0 - 8 -14	Sidney Get
				22.7 -14 -14	Dick Schultz
				21.9 - 9 - 9	Don Parks
				20.5 -25 -27	Margaret Semignani
				10.9 -20 -20	Phil Castora

Second Board

Charles Wells (W)	77.6	+23	+25	45.1 - 2 +14	Greg Long
Eud Pendergrass (W)	77.3	+14	+ 7	45.1 - 2 - 2	Mark Owings
James Dygert (W)	76.0	+22	+30	42.8 - 2 - 2	Michael Makulin
John Koning (W)	75.8	+31	+37	41.7 - 2 + 3	Wank Reinhardt
Larry Peery (W)	75.8	+16	+22	40.3 - 4 - 5	Dave Francis
Don Barrows (W)	75.0	+ 8	+12	38.3 - 6 -10	Jack Chalker
Eduard Hille (W)	75.0	+ 6	+10	35.8 -17 -18	Roland Trudiker
				34.4 - 5 - 9	Karl Wittmann
				33.8 -10 -14	Brian Bailey
				33.3 - 4 -10	John Benson
				31.2 - 6 -10	Greg Warden
				25.0 - 6 0	Al Scott
				25.0 - 6 - 6	Dick Payment
				23.0 - 8 -14	Sidney Get
				22.7 -14 -14	Dick Schultz
				21.9 - 9 - 9	Don Parks
				20.5 -25 -27	Margaret Semignani
				10.9 -20 -20	Phil Castora

The Rest of Us

75.0 + 6 +10	Paul Leitch (W)	33.3 - 4 -10	John Benson
75.0 + 6 +10	Mehran Thomson (W)	31.2 - 6 -10	Greg Warden
74.2 +15 +17	Mod Walker	25.0 - 6 0	Al Scott
73.4 +12 +15	Ferry Much	25.0 - 6 - 6	Dick Payment
70.8 + 5 + 6	Rick Brooks	23.0 - 8 -14	Sidney Get
68.8 + 6 + 8	Bob Lake	22.7 -14 -14	Dick Schultz
66.7 + 4 +13	Jack Greene	21.9 - 9 - 9	Don Parks
66.7 + 4 - 1	Richard Bryant	20.5 -25 -27	Margaret Semignani
66.7 + 4 0	Chris Wagner	10.9 -20 -20	Phil Castora

Chuck Carey	+9	Keith Koalenz	+1
Cole Harrison	+7	John Leckner	+1
Buddy Trettick	+7	Wm. McLinn	+1
Doug Baker	+5	Harry Manogg	+1
W. Gerald White	+5	John Messer	+1
Hugh Anderson	+4	Jim Perkins	+1
Thomas Miller	+4	Polan	+1
Dick Reiter	+4	Mike Santos	0
Wm. Connelly	+3	Wayne M. Schisel	-1
Mike Miller	+3	Jay Waldeman	-2
Geo. Schelz	+3	Bruce Pandolfini	-4
Sid Cochran	+2	Lee Arico	-6
Richard Czata	+2	Robert Maloney	-6
Bob Weston	+2	Bob Reiter	-6
Norman Zinkhan	+2	James Tuttle	-6
Robert Curran	+1	Louis Gallo	-8
Ron Dellbringge	+1	Gordon Stephen	-16
Donald Metsko	+1	Ron Glavie	-18
Bob Minney	+1		

Sealed Bag

John R. Moot, President, Games Research, Inc., 48 Wareham St.,
Boston, Mass.:

I am arranging to have the rules revised.

((+(That is the best news concerning Diplomacy that I have heard in
a long time. jamcc)+))

Douglas Deyerlein, 3934 S. W. Southern, Seattle, Wash., 98116:

I was re-reading EROB #88 and your article on
a possible change in the EROB Rating List. ...the last paragraph
on page 17. You brought up the point about surviving players all
getting the same score -- other than the winner -- this sounded
good, but I ran into some problems. E.g., when the game ends 13-16
with only two survivors the winner gets six points but what about
the second and third places? A player eliminated and a player
finishing a close second with 16 units should not both get plus
three points.

I hope to start a Diplomacy Club at the University of
Washington and a rating list will be needed. (In this connection
could you print the following:)

Attention: All high school seniors who plan to attend college next
year. The University of Washington and Seattle offer the best in
education and Diplomacy league play together. The U of Washington
is one of the finest and largest academic centers in the United
States with over 32,000 enrolled students. The Seattle area
boasts the most active Diplomacy league anywhere with over 30 players
and plans to start a club at the U of Wash. For more information on
the U of Washington concerning entrance requirements, fees, etc.,

write: Office of Admission, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash., 98105, or talk to your college advisor at your high school. For information on Diplomacy write: Douglas Peyerlein, 3934 S.W. Southern, Seattle, Wash., 98116

I have sold EFGIANT to Mal Hous. Without a trade I am without BROB, therefore I wish to subscribe to your zine, but alas I am very short of money at present.

((+(With all the talk of student protest and so on in the news it is refreshing to see one aspect of student life which hasn't changed over the years, a chronic shortage of funds. One way to be sure of getting BROB would be to have a letter in every issue, then I would have to send you a copy, wouldn't I?

As to the proposed Rating List change, you have misunderstood what I proposed to do. As stated in #88 players eliminated would be treated exactly as before. Survivors, other than the winner, would lose to the winner, win a point from each of those eliminated but draw among themselves. Therefore, in a game with only two survivors, the winner and one other, the other survivor would get +4, exactly as in the current BROB system. We can make a table if you like:

<u>No. of</u> <u>Survivors</u>	<u>Winner's</u> <u>Score</u>	<u>Survivor's</u> <u>Score</u>	<u>Score of last</u> <u>eliminated</u>
2	+6	+4	+2
3	+6	+3	0
4	+6	+2	-2
5	+6	+1	-4
6	+6	0	-6
7	+6	-1	-7

Only in the case you mention, i.e. of two survivors, would an eliminated player get a positive score. Only in case of all seven players surviving would the score of a surviving player be negative. By the way, this last case has not yet occurred in postal play, although there has been a game with 6 survivors.

Best of luck with the proposed club. But I thought that Youngstown was the accepted place for those wanting to major in Diplomacy. And, for Canadians, there is now Saskatchewan. See elsewhere in this issue. jamcc)+))

Ed Hille, Gainesville, Fla.:

To your knowledge, has anyone ever suggested the weighting of a person's score by the factor rating of the country he is playing? I had thought of this some time ago.

((+(That scores should be adjusted to take account of the difficulty of the country played has been suggested several times. Most recently,

I think, by Derek Nelson. My attempt to provide such a listing, in DRON #75, published just about a year ago, was not liked by Derek, was only commented on by one other person, I believe, namely John Koning, who was trying to do something similar himself, and the whole idea was dropped. My way of getting at it was not quite the one you suggest; as I understand you you propose multiplying the score by a weight which will be a little larger than 1 for the 'difficult' countries and a little less than 1 for the perennial winners. The way I did it was to add a handicap figure to a players score. For Russia which ends up, on the average, just about in the middle there would be no handicap. But a player for Italy, say, would get about a point added to his score, and a player for Turkey would have a subtraction. jamcc)+))

Eugene Prosnitz, 200 Clinton St., Brooklyn, NY , 11201:

You may have read my letter in sTab (#55) about the telephone game, so I won't repeat my arguments, which were that this game should not be rated in a postal rating system. Peshara argues that a telephone game . . . may be the highest form of skill. I agree with him, since a telephone game combines the abundant negotiations which take place in an over the board game, with the technical move accuracy which should take place when you have a long time to think about your moves. (As you know, my main criticism of postal diplomacy is that players don't do enough negotiating.)

However, even though a telephone game may be the highest test of skill, it's a different type of skill than that of negotiating by mail in postal play, and therefore should not be rated along with the postal games. (Of course, if enough telephone games were played, a separate rating system should be established for them.)

((+ (Well, Gene, at about the same time as I received your letter I received a carbon copy of a letter from Peshara to Koning. He urges the high standard which he is imposing on his telephone game as a reason for its inclusion in the Roster which Koning maintains and, thereby, in the Rating Lists. Frankly, it seems to me that neither of you are arguing to the question at all and that most of what each of you say in support of your respective position is quite irrelevant.

To take Peshara's point first. He tells in detail how he is running the game. He feels that his procedure will produce a game where chance will play little part and the outcome will be decided by skill and skill alone. Supposing that, for the sake of argument, we accept his feeling that he has the best possible organization for his game and that its outcome will be a high test of skill. Is this any argument for its inclusion in the Rating Lists? In my opinion, not at all. The ordinary postal games, now included in the Roster, and in the Rating lists, differ greatly in negotiation and players' effort put into them. Game 1986A, in Lonely Mountain, mentioned elsewhere in this issue, was a game with the same set of players throughout. While I was in it I know that negotiation was continuous in the sections of the board where I

found myself. I can't be sure, of course, what went on in other sectors, nor what happened after I was eliminated. However, the impression I have is that throughout the game interest of all players was high, and that all players did their best, both diplomatically and tactically, for the full course of the game. But we all know that not all postal games are like that. There are games in which half the players are replacements who have been more or less bludgeoned into taking over a deserted position and who have no real interest in it. Most of the players are bored with the game, in some cases one gets the feeling that all of them are. Do the Rosters and Rating Lists make any distinction between these two types of games, accepting the first and throwing out the second? Not a bit of it. Games with high player interest and constant negotiation and games where these qualities are low or absent are both accepted in the Rating Lists on an exactly equal basis. So, it seems to me, Deshara's argument, however true, says nothing at all about the point at issue.

But your argument for excluding this game is not a bit better than Deshara's. You say that a telephone game has a different type of skill than is found in the more usual postal game. Point one: This argument, at least in part, is obviously untrue. In every postal game with a fast playing rate that I have ever been in for any length of time, I have used the long-distance telephone. So have many other players. The early Parad-Dur and Orthanc games were made up, for the most part, of people living in the Washington and Baltimore areas. Many of them saw each other frequently; even for those who didn't, the toll charge between Washington and Baltimore is small and there must have been many many cases of personal or telephonic communication. I cite these instances only as examples. We can take it for granted, I think, that nearly every game has had some personal or telephone communication, and many of them have had a very great deal. So that your feeling that Deshara's telephone game is something sui generis is quite untrue: it is near one end of the spectrum, that is all. Point two: Just as with Deshara, I fail to see the relevance of the argument, even if it were true in fact. The amount of negotiation that went on in the course of it has never been a criterion for accepting or rejecting a game for inclusion in the Roster or in the Rating Lists. So why should the purportedly greater amount of negotiation in that game affect the issue one way or the other?

It seems to me that there are really only two different types of Diplomacy games. The first is the standard over-the-board game, 10-15 minutes being allowed per move, and negotiations being conducted in cubboards, corners, neighbouring rooms, and the like. The other is what we might call the delayed action game. It includes move-a-week games, mail games, telephone games, and so on. And there are it seems to me two, and only two, differences between the two games:

1. The time element. In the first type of game, especially for newer players, there just isn't time to see the possibilities in complete detail. Moves must therefore be made on a more or

uninformed fashion: they are the best ~~he~~ he can see at the moment, not necessarily the best he could see if given sufficient time to study the situation. In the delayed action game, on the other hand, the player has effectively unlimited time. I mean as far as deciding what should be done. He might like more time for convincing other players but, in all forms of the delayed action game, he always has all the time he can use as far as making up his own mind is concerned.

2. In the standard game diplomacy can never be fully secret. The details are not known to the other players of course, but if Russia and Turkey are seen in a long and earnest huddle, certain inferences can always be drawn by the other players. In all of the delayed action games, on the other hand, negotiation is fully secret: no one knows who has spoken to whom, except in so far as those parties care to reveal the facts.

This being the only real division it would perhaps have been best to have included all the delayed-action-games in the Roster (and, as a matter of fact, they all have been, though sometimes with a notation to indicate their status) and in the rating lists. Why I did not do this with the RHOB Rating List was a matter of convenience, not of principle as I explained when that Rating List began. In this connection it might be of interest to look at the LASMS games.

The Los Angeles Science Fiction Society is a fairly large body. It has frequent meetings. In 1963 a diplomacy craze hit this body. Several move-a-week games were begun. The moves were made near the end of the regular weekly meetings, the players sitting around a table and turning up their moves in the usual way. There may often have been last minute negotiation at the meeting itself, but most was done by phone or in person during the course of the week. Bruce Pelz was a spectator and later a player in two of these games and acted as recording secretary for . . . them, publishing the moves in two bulletins, WorldDip and WitDip. Other players attempted to do the same for other games. The craze died out, most of the games were abandoned by mutual consent, and none of the bulletins, except Bruce's, published more than an issue or two. However, one game, the first formed, ended in the early spring of 1964, having been played to completion.

John Boardman, in Graustark, had used numbers to distinguish his games. About a year after the completion of the LASMS game, on the 23rd of May 1965, in Graustark #55, he published a short listing of all postal games completed and in progress. He called the item "Diplomacy Directory". The following issue of Graustark had a more complete and detailed version of it. These two first "Diplomacy Directories" published more than a year after completion of the LASMS game, contained no mention of it at all, although John was aware of their existence, and had, from time to time, run notices advising his readers of the publications WorldDip and WitDip, the former of which carried news of that game.

A further year after that, John began publishing in Graustark reports of the game being run in the Physics department of Brooklyn College. He assigned numbers to this game and listed it in the Roster,

as the former "Directory" was now renamed, in exactly the same fashion as the postal games were numbered. I wrote John and pointed out that it was inconsistent to list his own Brooklyn games and not the LASFS one which was run in exactly the same way. An excerpt from my letter was published in Srau #98 and in Srau #100, in a revised version of the Roster, game 1963, was listed for the first time. That is, the LASFS game was first listed in the Roster on the 13th of August 1966, almost three years after it began, more than two years after it ended, and about a year and a half after the Roster (or Directory) was established.

Now you can't be for ever revising a Rating List. Adding in new games as they finish is one thing but if you are going to have to back track two or three years from time to time to add in additional games, previously overlooked, it becomes altogether too much of a chore. For that reason I decided to include only postal games played in magazines, and not other types of delayed action games. I am not so sure now that the decision was wise. As you know, early last summer the Jeff Hey group discovered the main body of postal players through seeing an article of Rod Walker's in Strategy and Tactics. It may be that there are other similar groups scattered about. One or other of them may have published a bulletin of its games, which would then be eligible for the FROB Rating List. But, anyhow, my feeling earlier was that such publication, unknown to the rest of us, would be unlikely; while a move-a-week, or a telephone game, unknown to the rest of us, would be much more likely. So that is why, up to now, such games have not been included in the Frob Rating List.

While on the subject, I suppose I might as well state that I think that there is one type of postal game which should be excluded from all listings, and that on a matter of principle, and not merely convenience, as I have done with the move-a-week games. And that is a game where the person who acts as gamesmaster is himself a player in the game. Such a game is asymmetric. The player-gamesmaster either reads his mail as it comes in and makes his own moves near the deadline time, in which case he has knowledge of the moves of other players. Or, in order to avoid this, he makes up his own moves immediately on sending out the previous set of moves. In this latter case it is impossible to negotiate with him on quite the same basis as it is with other players whose moves have not yet been finalized. No game with a " " gamesmaster who is also a player in his own game will be rated in the FROB listing. With the phone game on the other hand I am far from sure; perhaps all such should be added in. -jamcc+))

- - - - -

Since writing the lead article on Dick Schultz I have received from him several copies of his story "Double-Double". If anyone wants one the price is fifteen cents, and the money will be sent to Dick as a small contribution to his Save "the Avengers" campaign.

New Blood.

The people listed below have written asking about postal Diplomacy. Some of them are new indeed, two letters having come in during the past few days. Others, however, due to EROB's present slow rate of publication, have long since signed up for games.

D. Johnston, 5451 Rockwood Road, Columbus, Ohio, 43224.

Jim Cheney, 2962 East Lamona, Fresno, Calif., 93703.

Lewis Pulsipher, RR#3, Box 189, Battle Creek, Mich., 49017.

Robert Perkins, 2755 Carlaris Road, San Marino, Calif., 91108.

Erad E. Wessel, 15 Oak Ave., Tarrytown, NY, 10591.

New Zines.

Verbal Chaos Ltd., published by Bill McDuffie, Clarkson College of Technology, Brooks House, Box 380, Potsdam, NY, 13676.

Spald, published by Robert Perkins, whose address is given above. There are openings.

Memedian Chninciles is published jointly by Gerhard Graebner, 309 Wearne, U. of Saskatchewan Residences, Saskatoon, Sask., and by Norman Zinkhan, 213 LaV., U. of Sask residences, etc. Its current game is limited to residents of Saskatoon and I believe that the same restriction is its policy for the game now forming. As it is well reduced by mimeo there seems no reason why it should not spread out a bit in future issues.

- - - - -

Diplomacy is a game manufactured and sold by Games Research Inc., 48 Wareham St., Boston, Mass., 02118.

Broddingnag is a magazine devoted to the play of that game by mail. It is edited and published by John McCallum, Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada. The price is ten cents a copy.